

Miller, Walker, and Salmon Basin Plan Project Management Team Meeting

Date: Thursday August 21, 2003

Time: 9:00AM – 12:00PM

Location: City of Burien City Manager's Conference Room

Meeting Summary

Attendees

Dan Bath	City of Burien
Bruce Bennett	King County
Steve Bennett	City of Normandy Park
Julie Cairn	King County
Steve Clark	City of Burien
Curt Crawford	King County
Bob Duffner	Port of Seattle
Roger Kuykendall	Gray & Osborne (for the City of Normandy Park)
Kimberly Lockard	King County Council
Mehrdad Moini	WSDOT
Dale Schroeder	City of SeaTac

Updates

July 31 PMT Meeting Summary

The PMT approved the July 31, 2003 PMT Meeting Summary as originally drafted. There was a clarification about the NW Hydraulics Engineers in attendance at the modeling meeting with King County staff on July 25th. The Cities of Normandy Park and Burien do not have a contract in place between themselves and NWH. These consultants attended the meeting on behalf of, and at the expense of, the ACC.

Draft Billing Information

Bruce distributed draft billing information for the project work completed during the first half of 2003. It included a breakdown by organization based on the ILA established cost shares. The actual bills are expected to be out in the next few weeks. The bills will reflect work done in the first half of 2003 (the hand out) + 2002 work for Normandy Park and WSDOT, which was not previously billed due to the need to amend the ILA.

The upcoming billing to partners will be similar to the last billing. The detail will correspond to the task breakdowns in the ILA.

Action items are highlighted

APPROVED ON 9/04/03

Upcoming Meetings and Schedules

The following meetings are currently scheduled. The September 11 PMT meeting was added based on a review of the schedule and of work that needs to be completed.

Date	Meeting
September 4, 2003*	PMT Meeting
September 11, 2003	PMT Meeting – ADDED AT THIS MEETING
September 18, 2003	Executive Committee Meeting
September 25, 2003	Salmon Creek Basin Public Meeting
October 2, 2003	PMT Meeting (NOTE – SAME DAY AS PUBLIC MTG)
October 2, 2003	Miller and Walker Creek Basins Public Meeting
October 16, 2003	Executive Committee Meeting
November 6, 2003	PMT Meeting
November and/or December, 2003 specific date TBD	Public Meeting/Open House Round #2 (Note: we’ve discussed this as a joint meeting and as two basin specific meetings at different points in time. – meeting minutes and April Public Information Strategy document)
December 4, 2003	PMT Meeting
December 18, 2003	Executive Committee Meeting
January, 2004 specific date TBD	POSSIBLE Public Meeting/Open House Round #3

* September 4 will be a “science day” of sorts. King County technical staff will in attendance to discuss the water quality, geology, and ecology of the basins, in order to help PMT members work toward strategy development.

A draft Executive Summary (including “key messages”) is needed by/at the September 4 PMT meeting for group discussion. **Bruce will draft this and distribute it before or at the September 4 PMT Meeting.** It will likely be modified based on presentations and discussions at the PMT meeting, but it will provide a starting point for discussion. This will be the basis of discussion for the September 18 Executive Committee Meeting and it will be a key element used in the 1st round of public meetings. Executive Committee members can also use this for their discussions with elected officials in advance of the public meetings.

Discuss Future Interactions with ACC and Other Groups

Following up on last month’s discussion, the PMT reiterated that consultants not specifically under contract to project partners to support this basin planning effort will be treated like the general public in terms of data and information requests. Only information previously approved by the PMT can be released to the general public and as such it would be qualified (draft/preliminary or final, as appropriate).

Action items are highlighted

Discussion of Latest Hydrologic Modeling Runs and of Draft Mitigation Costs Graph

Modeling Runs

Bruce distributed flow frequency and duration analyses curves for hydrologic model runs for Salmon, Miller, and Walker basins.

The Scene 5 (Low Impact Development) duration analysis curve for Miller was corrected from the last meeting. (The Scene04 and Scene 05 lines appeared to be identical in the handouts last month.) Even with the correction, the two lines are still fairly close to one another. This is because for both of these scenarios, the flow is going through a flow control facility. In addition, the change in land cover between non-LID and LID is from impervious to grass, not as large of a change hydrologically relative to a forested condition.

The duration analyses graphs for all three basins were reprinted using an expanded scale, to show the detail for the more frequent storms.

In reviewing the Walker Creek graphs, there was a question concerning the duration analyses. The forested and BDHA (75/15/10) curves show flows higher than all other modeled scenarios for the most frequent storms (those from approximately the 10% to 100% exceedance interval – the right side of the graph). It was speculated that this result might be due to higher base flows under the forested and 75/15/10 scenarios, or simply within the error of the model. **Bruce will check with the modelers about this and report back to the PMT.**

Mitigation Costs Graph and Table for Miller Creek

Bruce distributed a hand drawn DRAFT Mitigation Cost graph and table for Miller Creek, similar to what might be used in an MEP (Maximum Extent Practicable) analysis under the Clean Water Act (CWA). The graph depicts the costs of detention storage (in vaults) in relation to the various modeling scenarios (scenes) based on the mitigation of erosive work. A similar graph and table will be produced for Walker Creek when the data are available.

The various modeling runs (scenes) determined the volume of detention storage needed in acre-feet. The costs were calculated based on the storage needed and unit costs used by WSDOT for storage in vaults. The WSDOT unit costs used were \$220k/acre-foot, which is \$5/cubic foot. These are consistent with unit costs King County staff have previously used.

The mitigation of erosive work is calculated along a continuum between 0 and 1. Forested land cover represents a mitigation of erosive work value of 1.0, as it represents the mitigation of erosive work to levels that occurred under fully forested conditions. No mitigation is represented by a value of 0 for mitigation of erosive work.

A value for mitigation of erosive work was calculated for each modeling scenario by first calculating relative stream power for flows greater than 50% of the forested 2-year flow (assumed threshold of movement of channel sediments in a natural stream). Relative stream power was estimated by summing the product of a range of flowrates raised to the

Action items are highlighted

1.5 power times the percent of time these flowrates occur, normalized relative to the fully-forested flow regime. The relative stream power was then converted to % mitigation based on relative stream power using the following equation: $(\text{future} - \text{scenario}) / (\text{future} - \text{forested})$, where future is the future landcover without flow control mitigation.

The current condition was not on the DRAFT chart, but it represents a mitigation of erosive work value of 0.26. Also, the lines labeled "Level 1" and "Level 2" on the graph actually correspond to "Scene 01" and "Scene 02" of the model runs, and the line labeled "75/15/10" represents the basin-wide application of Level 2 flow control that matches flow durations for a basin condition that is 75% forested, 15% grass, and 10% impervious. Scene 01, which is Level 1 flow control applied to the red parcels in the basin (those likely to be developed or re-developed), provided a mitigation of erosive work value of 0.22, slightly more erosive than current conditions, at a cost of about \$2,000,000. Scene 02, which is Level 2 flow control matching forested condition flow durations for the red parcels, provided a mitigation level of 0.32 at a cost of about \$19,000,000. 75/15/10, which is basin-wide application of Level 2 flow control matching 75/15/10 condition flow durations, provided a mitigation of erosive work value of 0.65, at a cost of \$49,000,000.

It should be noted that the majority of the costs reflected in the graph for Scene 01 and Scene 02 would likely be developer-spent dollars incurred through regulation of future development. Beyond Scene 02, the additional cost of \$30 million to achieve the 75/15/10 level of mitigation would have to be public-spent dollars for construction of regional detention facilities if it was decided that the benefit was to be realized in the short term. The additional cost could also be incurred by developers if it was decided that a longer time was acceptable.

This analysis raised questions that the PMT members need to grapple with and ultimately resolve:

How can this type of analysis be tied to the project goals? These may need to be refined and made more specific from the very general goals and objectives initially identified.

How do we define "function" in terms of the stream systems, and how do we determine adequacy of that function?

What type of decision analysis will the group use to identify and evaluate the alternative management strategies for the basins? The options and their benefits are different in each basin. It is expected that the recommended strategies will include combinations of projects or programs.

If low impact development (LID) is a program element, how will an agency implement that in a meaningful way?

What are some likely project funding strategies for the implementation phase (loans, grants, legislators, agency cost shares, and developer cost trades)?

Action items are highlighted

Fish Productivity Note:

We had hoped to have fish count data from Washington Trout, based on work they were doing over the last few months. Apparently they did not do an actual fish count. They were doing a “habitat assessment.” This leaves a data gap we had hoped would be filled.

The Port of Seattle is doing some fish surveys/counts on their property. This represents only a portion of the basin, but it might still be useful, and they will share their data when it is available.

Preparation for Public Meetings

As discussed above, Bruce will draft an Executive Summary (including “key messages”) and distribute it before or at the September 4 PMT Meeting.

The scope of the first round of public meetings was discussed, and modified somewhat from earlier meeting discussions.

Based on the meeting discussion, the purpose of the first round of public meetings is to:

- Provide an overview of the goals and objectives of this basin planning project.
- Provide an overview of the existing conditions in each basin.
- Provide an overview of the problems that have been identified.
- Discuss some potential strategies that could be used to address these problems. These strategies could include a combination of actions such as stormwater facility improvements, instream habitat improvements, changes to development regulations, and adjustments to local stormwater management programs.
- Gather public questions and comments.
- Let the public know what additional opportunities exist for them to provide input to the project.

Julie will develop some content to post on the Web site pertaining to the 1st round of public meetings, and distribute it to PMT members for their review and feedback.

Related Attachments

July 31 PMT Meeting Summary - Final	 "073103 PMT Meeting Summary.do"
-------------------------------------	---

Action items are highlighted

Miller, Walker, and Salmon Basin Plan Project Management Team Meeting

Date: Thursday July 31, 2003

Time: 9:00AM – 12:00PM

Location: City of Burien City Manager's Conference Room

Meeting Summary

Attendees

Dan Bath	City of Burien
Bruce Bennett	King County
Steve Bennett	City of Normandy Park
Julie Cairn	King County
Steve Clark	City of Burien
Curt Crawford	King County
Bob Duffner	Port of Seattle
Roger Kuykendall	Gray & Osborne (for the City of Normandy Park) rkuykendall@g-o.com 206-284-0860
Mehrdad Moini	WSDOT
Dale Schroeder	City of SeaTac

Updates

July 3 PMT Meeting Summary

The PMT approved the July 3, 2003 PMT Meeting Summary as drafted.

ILA Amendment

Bruce distributed copies of the signed ILA amendment.

Next Project Billing from King County

Project partners will be receiving a bill in the near future for project work completed during the first six months of 2003. Partners who were not billed for 2002 work yet will receive a bill for their respective share of 2002 costs and for the first six months of 2003 costs.

Executive Committee Meeting and Membership Confirmation

Executive Committee representation was discussed. With Cal Hoggard's departure from the King County Executive's office and Maureen Welch's retirement from her position as Deputy Director of the King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks, Rod Hansen, the new Deputy Director of DNRP, will be the new Executive Committee

Action items are highlighted

representative, and Craig Stone (the Project Director for 509/518) will be the WSDOT representative on the Executive Committee.

The dates for the future Executive Committee Meetings were confirmed as:

September 18 (purpose: provide a project status report)

October 16 (review and discuss the Draft report)

December 18 (review the Final Draft)

All meetings will be at the City of Burien offices.

Public Meeting Date Confirmations

The following dates, times, and locations have been confirmed for the first basin-specific meetings/presentations. The scope of each meeting is to provide an overview of the problems and recommended solutions.

September 25 Salmon Basin (at Shorewood Elementary)

October 2 Miller and Walker Basins (at the Criminal Justice Training Center)

The time for each is 6:30 – 8:00 with the formal presentation portion starting at 7:00. Display boards would be up for people to look at prior to the presentation.

Bruce still needs to put together a cost estimate to have King County technical staff (Mason Bowles, John Bethel, and Kate Rhoads for both presentations; and Kelly Whiting for Miller/Walker only) prepare for and be present at the meetings.

The City of Burien will do press releases for each of the meetings. Project Partners can let Steve Clark know if they have anything to add to the releases. Steve will share the press releases with other agencies if they want to use them as well.

Report on Hydrology Meeting between King County Staff and NW Hydraulics Engineers

At the request of Julia Patterson's office, a meetings was held between King County modeling staff (Kelly Whiting and Jeff Jacobson) and ACC consultant modelers (Malcolm Leytham and Bill Rozeboom) from NW Hydraulics. The meeting occurred on July 25. Bruce Bennett was also present.

King County modelers provided a CD-ROM with copies of information that had previously been presented to the PMT members. The information provided was characterized as Preliminary and DRAFT. Kelly walked through the modeling work that had been done and presented to date. The NW Hydraulics staff had questions about assumptions that were used in the modeling, specifically related to soils, landcover, the Port properties, and the PCHB decision.

King County staff reiterated that the basin plan modeling for the Port areas assumed the implementation of the approved mitigation plan elements. They also reiterated that the scope of the basin plan does not include any evaluation of the efficacy of the Port's approved mitigation plan, and pursuant PCHB findings.

Action items are highlighted

King County staff also shared information on the breadth of resources that have been used in the project so far. These include information from the City of Burien, the Port of Seattle, WSDOT, and others.

The NW Hydraulics staff will be reviewing the information provided, and there will be a follow-up meeting in the future for them to share any concerns or feedback, and to ask additional questions. King County staff welcome the technical suggestions these consultants might have to offer.

After some additional discussion, it was highlighted that the NW Hydraulics consultants had attended the meeting as paid hydrologic consultants to the City of Normandy Park and the City of Burien, not as consultants to the ACC. It was noted that these same individuals have provided modeling support to the ACC in the past, but that for this latest meeting and the future meeting, they are working for the Cities of Normandy Park and Burien. The City of Burien staff will work with Bruce to set up the follow-up meeting between their modeling consultants and the King County modelers.

Discussion of Process for Meeting or Information Requests Related to the Project

The PMT discussed the process that project partners should use if meetings or information is requested outside of the PMT. The purpose of this discussion was to devise a mechanism to keep all Partners advised of requests and to provide a mechanism for discussion, especially since such requests likely will require the incursion of costs that can reasonably be charged to the project budget. It was decided that any future requests should result in an email notice being sent to all PMT members explaining the details of the request and inviting discussion amongst the Partners. The PMT member receiving the request should initiate the email to the other PMT members.

For the hydrology meeting that already occurred, King County staff will not be charging the project budget for their time because it was not discussed ahead of time. The King County staff time for the follow up meeting can be charged to the project budget, per the discussion of the PMT members, even if it results in the use of contingency funds.

It was generally noted that additional meetings between King County staff and Project Partners or their hired consultants, in order to improve understanding and information exchange, are generally worthy of project support and funding, but this should be confirmed on a case by case basis.

The PMT confirmed that in any such meetings, only information previously shared with the PMT could be shared with others. No information is to be released to the public as final until it is APPROVED by the PMT. Information shared with PMT members and consultants is shared as Draft or Preliminary information only. The PMT will have sole discretion in determining when information is available for general public viewing and the status of that information, either preliminary or final.

Action items are highlighted

Discussion of Additional Hydrologic Model Runs

Bruce distributed flow frequency and duration analyses for hydrologic model runs for Salmon, Miller, and Walker basins. Bruce also distributed a legend for these analyses. Since the last meeting, duration run analyses were conducted for the three basins. Previously, only peak flow frequency data were available. Additional model runs were also made (Scenes 03, 04, and 05) based on previous discussions.

Low flow analysis results have not been presented to the PMT yet.

Bruce provided an overview of the latest modeling data. The PMT discussed the graphs. Based on those discussions, there are some items Bruce needs to get confirmation on from the modelers.

The group discussed the implications of recommending one flow scenario over another, what the potential impacts would be to the ecological system, the geology, the individual jurisdictions, and residents.

Bruce presented a concept for doing cost benefit analyses looking at the options for flow control. Curt suggested a “knee of the curve” type of approach might be accepted by Ecology, because we could argue that these are urbanized, fully developed basins in which we are trying to conduct “restoration”. Under similar scenarios, MEP (maximum extent practicable) treatment requirements have been successfully argued, which provides an opportunity to factor cost-benefit into the planning.

Bruce is starting to gather cost information that could be used in this analysis.

Bob Duffner informed the group that the Des Moines Basin Plan was recently submitted to Ecology for concurrence. This submission was made on behalf of all the Des Moines Basin Plan Project Partners.

The PMT discussed the benefits of submitting our basin plan to Ecology for concurrence in a similar fashion. It was recommended that someone talk to Ecology about our submitting our plan, in order to hear any technical, policy, or procedural concerns or suggestions based on the Des Moines Basin Plan. After a draft is developed, an assignment will be made to follow-up on this item.

Post Meeting Item – Brett Fish and Ecology

As the meeting was adjourned, Bob Duffner remembered he had an item to announce. Brett Fish contacted the Department of Ecology about an increase in “white stuff” on the rocks in Miller Creek. His theory was that this increase was a result of the Port’s hydroseeding practices.

Ecology sent the complaint to the Port of Seattle. The Port had Taylor & Associates do some onsite evaluation. The finding was that the “white stuff” was periphyton.

The Port has written a response letter, which they will be sending to Ecology with a report in the next week. Bob Duffner will pass a copy of the report onto Bruce Bennett. Bruce is copied on the cover letter to Ecology.

Action items are highlighted



Next Meetings

August 21, 2003 PMT Meeting 9AM – Noon
City of Burien City Manager's Conference Room

September 4, 2003 PMT Meeting 9AM – Noon
City of Burien City Manager's Conference Room

September 18, 2003 Executive Committee Meeting
at the City of Burien

Related Attachments

July 3 PMT Meeting Summary - Final	 "070303 PMT Meeting Summary.doc
July 31 legend for modeling scenarios	 legendforhandout73 1.doc

Action items are highlighted